

PATENT

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Title: "System and Method for Dynamically Adapting a Banner Advertisement to the Content of a Web Page"	
Applicant(s): Reiner Kraft et al.	
Attorney Docket No.: ARC9-2000-0100-US1	
Serial No.: 09/617,455	Examiner: Stephen Gravini
Filed: 07/17/2000	Art Unit: 3622

Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

SUPPLEMENTAL APPEAL BRIEF
REQUEST FOR REINSTATEMENT OF APPEAL

Dear Sir:

(1) Request For Reinstatement Of Appeal

In response to the office action of September 17, 2004, Applicants respectfully request the reinstatement of the appeal.

(2) Summary Prosecution History

Claims 1 - 26 are pending, and remain in the application. In the Final Office Action of September 17, 2004, the claims were indicated to be rejected as follows:

ARC9-2000-0100-US1

1

RECEIVED
2004 DEC 21 AM 10:02
BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS
AND INTERFERENCES

RECEIVED
DEC 28 2004
GROUP 3600

- Claims 1-16 and 22-26 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 on the ground that the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.
- Claims 1-3, 17, 18, 22, and 23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Kurtzman II et al. (6,144,944).
- Claims 4-16, 19-21, and 24-26 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kurtzman II et al (6,144,944).

(3) Summary of the Invention

Applicants reproduce the summary of the present invention with added annotated and reference to the application, so that the appeal documents remain cogent and focused. The present invention relates in general to a software system and associated method for use in e-commerce advertising with a search engine over a network. More specifically, this invention pertains to a computer software product for dynamically adapting a banner advertisement to the categorization, surrounding page content, and changes of the advertiser's repository.

The present invention will now described in connection with the problems it addresses. In general, banner ads can have text, still or moving graphics, or multimedia messages, and typically serve as hypertext links, such that the user is linked to other specified pages if the user clicks on the banner ads. Banner ads can be categorized as corporate image ads, and information ads.

The purpose of corporate image ads is to enhance the visibility and public image of a business enterprise, and to reflect its presence, participation and involvement in a particular domain. It is therefore crucial to prevent the misplacement of ads that disadvantageously affect the public image of an enterprise.

The information banner ads highlight a specific product, service, or content, and provide a URL to corresponding content information pages. The context placement of these banner ads is critical in that it needs to match the interests of potential customers. Currently, advertisers are able to select the surrounding content of the banner ads based primarily on the content categories.

For example, a developer portal wishes to advertise on a search service provider such as Yahoo!® in order to gain more traffic. Search service providers offer a variety of categories where to place product or content ads. As an illustration, "software development", "Java®", "XML", etc. might constitute reasonable categories for an ad placement for the developer portal. **To place the same ad within a "Home & Garden" category would be a misplacement,** since the percentage of potential customers who are simultaneously seeking home and garden products and a software development product is not high.

Such misplacement is a common occurrence due in part to the static nature of the banner ad. As products and services of a company continue to change, it would be advantageous to have the banner ads automatically reflect these changes. As an example, for a data store carrying a variety of products and services, it would be desirable to have the newer or top rated products and services within specific categories automatically updated and displayed in the banner ads. Prior to the advent of the present invention, the most viable approach was for the advertiser to manually update the banner ads to reflect the desired products and services.

Such a "static approach" presents several disadvantages, among which are the following:

a) the selection might become obsolete after a short period of time;
and

b) the maintenance effort to administer and manage the banner ads will be too high to support over an extended period of time. In particular, the problem of maintaining the banner ads content up to date becomes increasingly difficult for companies that provide a variety of different products and multimedia information within a repository that continuously changes over a short time interval.

To this end, the adaptive advertising system 10 (FIGS. 1, 2, and 3) of the present invention dynamically adapts the content of a banner ad to the categorization, surrounding page content, and changes of the advertiser's repository of products and services. In addition, the adaptive advertising system 10 provides appropriate information resources based on the user's needs.

As a result, the adaptive advertising system 10 provides the capability to serve advertisements with adaptive contents. This level of adaptivity ensures that the content of the banner advertisement reflects the current content of the web page where it is embedded, with a high degree of confidence. Advertisers using advertisements with adaptive content are relieved from the tedious and time and resource consuming task of having to repeatedly create new advertisements that are specifically designed for different page contents. The adaptive advertising system 10 will automatically adapt the advertisement to the continuously changing

page content.

Based on the page content, the adaptive advertising system determines whether or not to display the banner advertisement. If the content is inappropriate, the adaptive advertising system might decide not to display the banner advertisement to avoid an undesirable association between the banner advertisement and the page content. **As an illustration,** consider an IBM advertisement within the "comp.programming" category being displayed next to an article with an obscene content. **IBM's corporate image might not be well served with such an undesirable association.** The adaptive advertising system identifies this scenario, **and disables itself, i.e., prevents the display of the banner ad, to avoid such a negative image association.**

Therefore, the adaptive advertising system either displays or suppresses the banner ad based on the surrounding page content. This involves taking any one or more of the following steps:

- a) Fine tuning the advertisement by showing the advertisement in the proper specialized category.
- b) Replacing the category content.
- c) The adaptive advertising system disables the advertisement until such time as the page content changes.

Transparently to the user, the system 10 continuously operates in the background to adapt banner advertisements based on the page content, surrounding content, and specific categorization or keywords provided by a domain specific repository. The system 10 is generally comprised of a banner display module 200, a keyword analyzer 210, an ad proxy router

212, an ad server 214, a banner advertising manager 220, an ad search engine 230, an indexer 252, an ad repository 240, an ad index repository 242, an advertiser site repository 244, and optionally a domain specific dictionary / repository 250. Page 15, line 20 through page 16, line 8.

The keyword analyzer 210 analyzes the page content, and the banner display module 200 determines the desirability of associating the advertisement with the page. If the banner display module 200 determines that such an association does not adversely impact the advertiser's image, the banner display module 200 selectively displays the advertisement. Otherwise, the banner display module 200 suppresses the advertisement. Page 16, lines 10 through 24.

The banner display module 200 sends a data stream containing the following information to the proxy router 212: the selected category; the keyword from the page; and the address of the ad server. In turn, the ad proxy router 212 sends the following information to the ad server 214: the session information; the selected category; and the keywords from the page.

The indexer 252 indexes the content of the advertiser's site, and stores the generated hyperlinks in the ad index repository. The ad repository stores the following: various advertisements from the advertiser; multimedia files; and executable codes or applications. Pages 17 and 18 and FIG. 4.

In one embodiment, the advertisement includes a static portion such as the advertiser's logo, and a dynamic portion. The dynamic portion can be

any one or more of: multimedia files; advertisements, executable codes, or hypertext links.

(4) Issues Presented for Review

1. The first issue for review is whether the rejection of claims 1-16 and 22-26 under 35 U.S.C. 101 is proper.

2. The second issue for review is whether claims 1-3, 17, 18, 22, and 23 are anticipated under 35 U.S.C. 102.

3. The seventh issue for review is whether claims 4-16, 19-21, and 24-26 are obvious under 35 U.S.C. 103.

(5) Arguments

5.1 - First issue: whether the rejection of claims 1-16 and 22-26 under 35 U.S.C. 101 is proper.

The Examiner rejected claims 1-16 and 22-26 under 35 U.S.C. 101 on the ground that the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter, reasoning that:

"In the present application, the above claims do not clearly indicate what steps or features are being performed by technology, such as a computer or through a computer network. For example, in Claim 1 a keyword analyzer could be a person scanning the content of a printed page, the module for determining the desirability of an advertisement could also be the same or a different person mentally matching the page's content with available advertisements, and then displaying (showing) the selected advertisement to someone (presumably a potential customer). In order to overcome this rejection, the Examiner suggests the Applicant amend the terminology in the claims to more clearly indicate which steps are being performed by what type of technology, such as "an electronic keyword analyzer for..."; an

electronic banner display module for automatically determining..."; and "the electronic banner display module selectively displaying at least a portion of the advertisement on a display screen if...". The Examiner also notes that the claimed "page" should be changed to "web page" or "electronic page" to clarify the environment in which the system is operating." Emphasis added.

Applicants refer to, and incorporate herein by reference, MPEP Sections 2106 and 2107 and the legal authorities cited therein, and particularly the following excerpts:

"The claimed invention as a whole must accomplish a **practical application**. **The written description will provide the clearest explanation of the applicant's invention**, by exemplifying the invention, explaining how it relates to the prior art and explaining the relative significance of various features of the invention. Claims to computer-related inventions that are clearly nonstatutory fall into the same general categories as nonstatutory claims in other arts, namely natural phenomena such as magnetism, and abstract ideas or laws of nature which constitute "descriptive material."
In practical terms, claims define nonstatutory processes if they:
- consist solely of mathematical operations without some claimed **practical application** (i.e., executing a "mathematical algorithm");
or
- simply manipulate abstract ideas, e.g., a bid (Schrader, 22 F.3d at 293-94, 30 USPQ2d at 1458-59) or a bubble hierarchy (Warmerdam, 33 F.3d at 1360, 31 USPQ2d at 1759), without some claimed practical application." (Emphasis added).

Applicants respectfully traverse the foregoing rejection and submit that **ALL** the rejected claims present sufficient structural support and practical and useful application, which obviate the need to amend the claim language to basically add the term "electronic" to qualify the terms. In particular, the Summary of the Invention above, as well as the application clearly explain that the components in the rejected claims are computer components and not users. More specifically, the application makes

repeated reference to the "automatic" function of these components, thus clearly distinguishing over the "manual" function performed by a user. Since, as explained earlier, the written description provides the clearest explanation of the applicant's invention, Applicants respectfully request that the terms not be redefined, and that their meanings be maintained within their reasonable bounds, as intended by Applicants in the application.

Applicants will now consider only the representative claim 1, with the understanding that all the rejected claims present similar structural and application support under 35 U.S.C. 101. Claim 1 provides as follows, with emphasis added:

"1. A system for dynamically adapting an advertisement based on a content of a page, comprising:
a keyword analyzer for analyzing the page content;
a banner display module for determining a desirability of associating the advertisement with the page; and
the banner display module selectively displaying at least a portion of the advertisement if an association between the advertisement and the page is determined to be desirable."

Applicants submit that representative claim 1 clearly recites two main structural elements: a keyword analyzer 210 and a banner display module 200. It eludes Applicants' reasonable understanding how the examiner could analogize the keyword analyzer and the banner display module to persons while the invention, as consistently described, refers to physical structures that perform automatic functions.

Therefore, Applicants submit that all the rejected claims are in compliance with 35 U.S.C. 101.

5.2 - Second issue: whether claims 1-3, 17, 18, 22, and 23 are anticipated under 35 U.S.C. 102

Claims 1-3, 17, 18, 22, and 23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Kurtzman II et al (6,144,944), reasoning as follows:

"Claims 1, 17, and 22: Kurtzman discloses a system, method and program for adapting an advertisement based on the content of a page, comprising:

- a. analyzing the page content (col 4, lines 50-57);
- b. determining the desirability of the advertisement with the page (col 4, lines 32-34); and
- c. displaying at least a portion of the desirable advertisement (col 5, lines 44-50).

Claims 2, 3, 18, and 23: Kurtzman discloses a system, method, and program for adapting an advertisement based on the content of a page as in Claims 1, 17, and 22 above, and further discloses not displaying inappropriate advertisements (col 23, lines 48-49) and displaying a first portion of the advertisement pending retrieval of a second portion of the advertisement (col 7, lines 32-39)."

Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection and submit that the rejected claims are not anticipated by Kurtzman. In support of this position, Applicants submit the following arguments.

A. Legal Standard for Lack of Novelty (Anticipation)

The standard for lack of novelty, that is, for "anticipation," is one of strict identity. To anticipate a claim for a patent, a single prior source must contain all its essential elements, and the burden of proving such anticipation is on the party making such assertion of anticipation. Anticipation cannot be shown by combining more than one reference to

show the elements of the claimed invention. The amount of newness and usefulness need only be minuscule to avoid a finding of lack of novelty.

The following are two court opinions in support of Applicants' position of non anticipation, with emphasis added for clarity purposes:

- "Anticipation under Section 102 can be found only if a reference shows exactly what is claimed; where there are differences between the reference disclosures and the claim, a rejection must be based on obviousness under Section 103." *Titanium Metals Corp. v. Banner*, 778 F.2d 775, 227 USPQ 773 (Fed. Cir. 1985).
- "Absence from a cited reference of any element of a claim of a patent negates anticipation of that claim by the reference." *Kloster Speedsteel AB v. Crucible Inc.*, 793 F.2d 1565, 230 USPQ 81 (Fed. Cir. 1986), on rehearing, 231 USPQ 160 (Fed. Cir. 1986).

B. Application of the Anticipation Standard

The Examiner refers to column 4, lines 32-34 of Kurtzman, which excerpt is reproduced below with emphasis added:

"The affinity of an attribute to an object is determined by comparing the attribute to an affinity criterion associated with the object. For instance, a user's demographic attribute would be compared to an advertisement's demographic criterion in order to measure the demographic affinity of the user to the advertisement."

Applicants respectfully submit that the foregoing excerpt clearly illustrates the distinction between the prior art and the present invention. In Kurtzman the comparison is based on the user's demographic affinity. On the other hand, Claims 1, 17 and 22 recite determining the association of the advertisement with the page, regardless of the user, the user's affinity, or the user's demographic data. It is not clear how

such irrelevant information causes the present invention to be anticipated, particularly that the relevant language of the claims has not been addressed. In particular, the Examiner did not cite a reference that bases the association of the advertisement on the content of the page.

Regarding the rejection ground of claims 2, 3, 18, and 23, stating that "Kurtzman discloses a system, method, and program for adapting an advertisement based on the content of a page as in Claims 1, 17, and 22 above, and further discloses not displaying inappropriate advertisements," Applicants reiterate that Kurtzman does not base the adaptation of the advertisement based on the content of a page, as stated by the Examiner. As a result, the selective display in Kurtzman is not based on the adaptation of the advertisement relative to the content of a page, but, as explained earlier, the selective display is based on the user's demographic affinity.

To conclude, claims 1-3, 17, 18, 22, and 23 are not anticipated by Kurtzman, and the allowance of these claims is respectfully requested.

5.3 - Third Issue: Whether claims 4-16, 19-21, and 24-26 are obvious under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)

Claims 4-16, 19-21, and 24-26 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kurtzman II et al (6,144,944). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection and submit the following supporting arguments.

A. Legal Standard for Obviousness

The following legal authorities set the general legal standards in support of Applicant's position of non obviousness, with emphasis added for added clarity:

- MPEP 706.02(j), **"To establish a prima facie case of obviousness, three basic criteria must be met.** First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Finally, **the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations.** The teaching or suggestion to make the claimed combination and the reasonable expectation of success must both be found in the prior art and not based on applicant's disclosure. In re Vaeck, 947 F.2d 488, 20 USPQ2d 1438 (Fed. Cir. 1991) ... The initial burden is on the examiner to provide some **suggestion of the desirability** of doing what the inventor has done. "To support the conclusion that the claimed invention is directed to obvious subject matter, either the **references must expressly or impliedly suggest the claimed invention** or the examiner must present a convincing line of reasoning as to why the artisan would have found the claimed invention to have been obvious in light of the teachings of the references." Ex parte Clapp, 227 USPQ 972, 973 (Bd. Pat. App. & Inter. 1985)."
- **In determining the differences between the prior art and the claims, the question under 35 U.S.C. 103 is** not whether the differences themselves would have been obvious, but **whether the claimed invention as a whole would have been obvious.** The prior art perceived a need for mechanisms to dampen resonance, whereas the inventor eliminated the need for dampening via the one-piece gapless support structure. "Because that insight was contrary to the understandings and expectations of the art, the structure effectuating it would not have been obvious to those skilled in the art." 713 F.2d at 785, 218 USPQ at 700 (citations omitted).
- MPEP §2143.03, "All Claim Limitations Must Be Taught or Suggested: To establish prima facie obviousness of a claimed invention, **all the claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art.** In re Royka, 490

F.2d 981, 180 USPQ 580 (CCPA 1974). "All words in a claim must be considered in judging the patentability of that claim against the prior art." *In re Wilson*, 424 F.2d 1382, 1385, 165 USPQ 494, 496 (CCPA 1970). If an independent claim is nonobvious under 35 U.S.C. 103, then any claim depending therefrom is nonobvious. *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988)."

- MPEP §2143.01, "The Prior Art Must Suggest The Desirability Of The Claimed Invention: There are three possible sources for a motivation to combine references: the nature of the problem to be solved, the teachings of the prior art, and the knowledge of persons of ordinary skill in the art." *In re Rouffet*, 149 F.3d 1350, 1357, 47 USPQ2d 1453, 1457-58 (Fed. Cir. 1998) (The combination of the references taught every element of the claimed invention, however without a motivation to combine, a rejection based on a prima facie case of obvious was held improper.). The level of skill in the art cannot be relied upon to provide the suggestion to combine references. *Al-Site Corp. v. VSI Int'l Inc.*, 174 F.3d 1308, 50 USPQ2d 1161 (Fed. Cir. 1999).
- "Obviousness cannot be established by combining the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention, absent some teaching or suggestion supporting the combination." *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d at 1075, 5 USPQ2d at 1598 (citing *ACS Hosp. Sys. v. Montefiore Hosp.*, 732 F.2d 1572, 1577, 221 USPQ 929, 933 (Fed. Cir. 1984)). What a reference teaches and whether it teaches toward or away from the claimed invention are questions of fact. See *Raytheon Co. v. Roper Corp.*, 724 F.2d 951, 960-61, 220 USPQ 592, 599-600 (Fed. Cir. 1983), cert. denied, 469 U.S. 835, 83 L. Ed. 2d 69, 105 S. Ct. 127 (1984). "
- "When a rejection depends on a combination of prior art references, there must be some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to combine the references. See *In re Geiger*, 815 F.2d 686, 688, 2 USPQ2d 1276, 1278 (Fed. Cir. 1987)." Obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either explicitly or implicitly in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See MPEP 2143.01; *In re Kotzab*, 217 F.3d 1365, 1370, 55 USPQ2d 1313, 1317 (Fed. Cir. 2000); *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988); and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992).

- "With respect to core factual findings in a determination of patentability, however, the Board cannot simply reach conclusions based on its own understanding or experience -- or on its assessment of what would be basic knowledge or common sense. Rather, the Board must point to some concrete evidence in the record in support of these findings." See *In re Zurko*, 258 F.3d 1379 (Fed. Cir. 2001).
- "We have noted that evidence of a suggestion, teaching, or motivation to combine may flow from the prior art references themselves, the knowledge of one of ordinary skill in the art, or, in some cases, from the nature of the problem to be solved, see *Pro-Mold & Tool Co. v. Great Lakes Plastics, Inc.*, 75 F.3d 1568, 1573, 37 USPQ2d 1626, 1630 (Fed. Cir. 1996), *Para-Ordinance Mfg. v. SGS Imports Intern., Inc.*, 73 F.3d 1085, 1088, 37 USPQ2d 1237, 1240 (Fed. Cir. 1995), although "the suggestion more often comes from the teachings of the pertinent references," *Rouffet*, 149 F.3d at 1355, 47 USPQ2d at 1456. The range of sources available, however, does not diminish the requirement for actual evidence. That is, the showing must be clear and particular. See, e.g., *C.R. Bard*, 157 F.3d at 1352, 48 USPQ2d at 1232. Broad conclusory statements regarding the teaching of multiple references, standing alone, are not "evidence." E.g., *McElmurry v. Arkansas Power & Light Co.*, 995 F.2d 1576, 1578, 27 USPQ2d 1129, 1131 (Fed. Cir. 1993) ("Mere denials and conclusory statements, however, are not sufficient to establish a genuine issue of material fact."); *In re Sichert*, 566 F.2d 1154, 1164, 196 USPQ 209, 217 (CCPA 1977)." See *In re Dembiczak*, 175 F.3d 994 (Fed. Cir. 1999).
- "To prevent the use of hindsight based on the invention to defeat patentability of the invention, this court requires the examiner to show a motivation to combine the references that create the case of obviousness. In other words, the examiner must show reasons that the skilled artisan, confronted with the same problems as the inventor and with no knowledge of the claimed invention, would select the elements from the cited prior art references for combination in the manner claimed." See *In re Rouffet*, 149 F.3d 1350 (Fed. Cir. 1998).
- The mere fact that references can be combined or modified does not render the resultant combination obvious unless the prior art also suggests the desirability of the combination. *In re Mills*, 916 F.2d 680, 16 USPQ2d 1430 (Fed. Cir. 1990). Although a prior art device "may be capable of being modified to run the way the apparatus is claimed, there must be a suggestion or motivation in the reference to do so." 916

F.2d at 682, 16 USPQ2d at 1432.). See also In re Fritch, 972 F.2d 1260, 23 USPQ2d 1780 (Fed. Cir. 1992) (flexible landscape edging device which is conformable to a ground surface of varying slope not suggested by combination of prior art references).

- If the proposed modification would render the prior art invention being modified unsatisfactory for its intended purpose, then there is no suggestion or motivation to make the proposed modification. In re Gordon, 733 F.2d 900, 221 USPQ 1125 (Fed. Cir. 1984).

B. Application of the Obviousness Standard

The Examiner presented the following ground in support of the obviousness rejection, with emphasis added:

"Claims 4-7, 19, and 24: Kurtzman discloses a system, method, and program for adapting an advertisement based on the content of a page as in Claims 3, 18, and 23 above, and further discloses displaying static or dynamic portions of an advertisement, multimedia file, executable code or hyperlink (col 2, lines 14-17 and 53-58). However, Kurtzman does not explicitly disclose that the first portion of the advertisement is a static portion which includes an advertiser's logo. Official Notice is taken that it is old and well known within the marketing arts to disclose static symbols or text (such as "Downloading") to a user while a file is being downloaded through a network. It is also well known for a company or advertiser to display its logo, such as has been done by network television stations displaying their call sign and logo during periods of non-reception or outages. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to display a static message, such as a logo, to the user while the system was waiting for the rest of the advertisement (such as Kurtzman's video advertisement) to finish downloading. One would have been motivated to display such a static logo while waiting for the rest of the advertisement to download in order to prevent the user being presented with a "blank" screen during the wait time."

It appears that the Examiner is relying on, and taking official notice of his personal experience to formulate the rejection ground. However, the

Examiner has not provided any evidence in support of the official notice. As a result, the rejection is deficient, and needs to be either withdrawn or additional evidence needs to be provided to support the rejection.

Nonetheless, assuming for the sake of arguments only that this rejection ground is acceptable, and that an advertisement includes a static portion, according to the present invention, such static portion would be displayed if, for example, the page content does not disadvantageously affect the advertiser's image. pending a retrieval of a second portion of the advertisement. Refer for example to claim 4 that depends on claim 3. The examiner's rejection is silent as to such determining prior to displaying the static portion of the advertisement, it being clearly understood that the invention must be considered as a whole and not dissected, as required by the legal authorities above.

To conclude, claims 4-7, 19, and 24 are not obvious in view of Kurtzman and the official notice considered by the Examiner, and the allowance of these claims is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: December 16, 2004
Samuel A. Kassatly Law Office
20690 View Oaks Way
San Jose, CA 95120
Tel.: (408) 323-5111
Fax: (408) 521-0111



Samuel A. Kassatly
Attorney for Applicants
Reg. No. 32,247

APPENDIX A
CLAIMS ON APPEAL

1. A system for dynamically adapting an advertisement based on a content of a page, comprising:
 - a keyword analyzer for analyzing the page content;
 - a banner display module for determining a desirability of associating the advertisement with the page; and
 - the banner display module selectively displaying at least a portion of the advertisement if an association between the advertisement and the page is determined to be desirable.
2. The system according to claim 1, wherein if the banner display module determines the association to be inappropriate relative to the page content, the banner display module suppresses the advertisement.
3. The system according to claim 2, wherein if the banner display module determines that the advertisement can be displayed without disadvantageously affecting an advertiser's image, the banner display module displays a first portion of the advertisement, pending a retrieval of a second portion of the advertisement.
4. The system according to claim 3, wherein the first portion of the advertisement is a static portion.
5. The system according to claim 4, wherein the second portion of the advertisement is a dynamic portion.

6. The system according to claim 4, wherein the static portion includes an advertiser's logo.

7. The system according to claim 5, wherein the dynamic portion is any one or more of: a multimedia file; an advertisement, an executable code, or a hypertext link.

8. The system according to claim 7, further including an ad server that serves an advertiser's site; and
wherein the ad server has an address.

9. The system according to claim 7, wherein the keyword analyzer specifies a selected category for the advertisement based on the page content.

10. The system according to claim 9, further including an ad proxy router; and
wherein the banner display module sends a data stream containing the following information to the proxy router:
the selected category;
at least one keyword from the page; and
the address of the ad server.

11. The system according to claim 10, wherein the ad proxy router sends the following information to the ad server:
session information;
the selected category; and
the at least one keyword from the page.

12. The system according to claim 8, wherein the advertiser's site includes a banner advertising manager.

13. The system according to claim 12, wherein the advertiser's site further includes an indexer for indexing the content of the advertiser's site, and for generating a plurality of hyperlinks therefrom; and
an ad index repository for storing the hyperlinks.

14. The system according to claim 13, wherein the advertiser's site further includes an ad repository for storing any one or more of the following:

- an advertisement;
- a multimedia file; or
- an executable code.

15. The system according to claim 9, wherein the page is classified under a current category; and

wherein the banner display module compares the current category and the selected category, and selects either the current category or the selected category.

16. The system according to claim 15, further including a domain specific dictionary for refining the selected category.

17. A computer program product for dynamically adapting an advertisement based on a content of a page, comprising:

- a keyword analyzer for analyzing the page content;

a banner display module for determining a desirability of associating the advertisement with the page; and

the banner display module selectively displaying at least a portion of the advertisement if an association between the advertisement and the page is determined to be desirable.

18. The computer program product according to claim 17, wherein if the banner display module determines the association to be inappropriate relative to the page content, the banner display module suppresses the advertisement; and

wherein if the banner display module determines that the advertisement can be displayed without disadvantageously affecting an advertiser's image, the banner display module displays a first portion of the advertisement, pending a retrieval of a second portion of the advertisement.

19. The computer program product according to claim 18, wherein the first portion of the advertisement is a static portion;

wherein the static portion includes an advertiser's logo;

wherein the second portion of the advertisement is a dynamic portion;

and

wherein the dynamic portion is any one or more of: a multimedia file; an advertisement, an executable code, or a hypertext link.

20. The computer program product according to claim 19, further including an ad server that serves an advertiser's site;

wherein the ad server has an address; and

wherein the keyword analyzer specifies a selected category for the advertisement based on the page content.

21. The computer program product according to claim 20, further including an ad proxy router;

wherein the banner display module sends a data stream containing the following information to the proxy router:

the selected category;

at least one keyword from the page; and

an address of the ad server; and

wherein the ad proxy router sends the following information to the ad server:

session information;

the selected category; and

the at least one keyword from the page.

22. A method for dynamically adapting an advertisement based on a content of a page, comprising:

a keyword analyzer for analyzing the page content;

a banner display module for determining a desirability of associating the advertisement with the page; and

the banner display module selectively displaying at least a portion of the advertisement if an association between the advertisement and the page is determined to be desirable.

23. The method according to claim 22, wherein if the association of the advertisement is determined to be inappropriate relative to the page content, the banner display module suppressing the advertisement; and

if the association of the advertisement is determined to be appropriate relative to the page content, the banner display module displaying a first portion of the advertisement, pending a retrieval of a second portion of the advertisement.

24. The method according to claim 23, further including displaying the second portion;

wherein the first portion of the advertisement is a static portion;

wherein the static portion includes an advertiser's logo;

wherein the second portion of the advertisement is a dynamic portion;

and

wherein the dynamic portion is any one or more of: a multimedia file; an advertisement, an executable code, or a hypertext link.

25. The method according to claim 24, further including the keyword analyzer specifying a selected category for the advertisement based on the page content.

26. The method according to claim 25, further including the banner display module sending a data stream containing the following information to a proxy router:

the selected category;

at least one keyword from the page; and

an address of an ad server; and

wherein the ad proxy router sends the following information to the ad server:

session information;

the selected category; and

the at least one keyword from the page.